

VOLUME III

APRIL, 1917

NUMBER 4

378.05
A5
A86
cop. 2

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
General Announcements.....	3
Association of American Colleges.....	4
Constitution of University of Utah.....	8
Report on University of Washington.....	13
Membership.....	17
Members Elected	17
Nominations	19

gift
Prof. E. C. Case
5-9-28

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

The publication of this BULLETIN has been delayed in order to include, if possible, the report on the University of Montana investigation carried out by a sub-committee of the Academic Freedom Committee of 1915. It has not proved practicable to do this, but the report will be available for publication shortly.

NOMINATIONS FOR OFFICERS.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS:

As the Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, appointed by President Thilly, I beg leave to suggest that it will be a great help to the Committee in making suitable nominations if the members of local branches will send in their suggestions for any of the officers (president, vice-president, treasurer) and for ten members of the Council for the term expiring January 1, 1921. The members of the Society now number over two thousand and it is obviously impossible for a nominating committee consisting of five members to have a personal acquaintance with more than a limited proportion of the total membership. We need the help and the suggestions of others in order to be guided in our choice, and I therefore hope that the members will feel free to send me lists of candidates for any or for all of the offices. With such lists before us our Committee will be in a very much better position to make a satisfactory selection.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.,
University of Pennsylvania Library,
Philadelphia, Pa.

The other members of the Nominating Committee are: E. G. Conklin (Princeton), W. H. Hobbs (Michigan), J. H. Latané (Johns Hopkins), E. L. Nichols (Cornell).

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS AND INSURANCE.—It is reported that the Commission organized by the Carnegie Foundation has completed its work, but details are not yet available. The chairman of our committee understands that the Commission has adopted a resolution stating in substance that all those who are now teachers in accepted institutions should receive the benefit of the pension under the existing plan.

PLACE OF NEXT ANNUAL MEETING.—A Council Submission corresponding in substance to the statement in the March BULLETIN has been sent to members of the Council with a request for preliminary replies by May first. Members of the Association interested in this question should communicate promptly with members of the Council in their vicinity either individually or through chairmen of local branches.

CONTRIBUTIONS—FINAL LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.—Three hundred and ninety members have contributed a total of \$1,020 in response to the invitation sent out in connection with the bills for annual dues. The amount of the deficit, \$930, is thus covered by a generous margin. Contributions from the following are gratefully acknowledged.

Bassett (Stanford)	Lindley (Indiana)
Bennett (Cornell)	Lorch (Michigan)
Blichfeldt (Stanford)	Lowrie (Cincinnati)
Carruth (Stanford)	Maclay (Columbia)
Cheyney (Pennsylvania)	Newbold (Pennsylvania)
Dodd (Chicago)	Popper (California)
DeLong (Colorado College)	Richards (Wisconsin)
Eckeley (Univ. of Colorado)	Robinson (Columbia)
Ellis (Texas)	Sampson (Cornell)
Ford (Harvard)	Smith (Washington, Seattle)
Gerrould (Princeton)	Snyder (Hopkins)
Greene (Hopkins)	Stoltenberg (Stanford)
Hamilton (Cornell)	Strieby (Colorado College)
Hardy (Dartmouth)	Thompson, F. L. (Amherst)
Haskins (Dartmouth)	Thomson (Washington, Seattle)
Holmes, R. W. (Smith)	Thieme (Michigan)
Huber (Michigan)	Tolman (Illinois)
Jones (Wisconsin)	Tufts (Chicago)
Knower (California)	Whitaker (Stanford)
Krehbiel (Stanford)	Willoughby (Hopkins)
Lehmer (California)	Wylie (Vassar)

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

This body also has been dealing with the subject of academic freedom and tenure of office. The report of the committee of the Association—Presidents Slocum of Colorado, Powell of Hobart, Kelly of Earlham—is published in the *Educational Review* for April, 1917. Extracts from the addresses of Presidents Welch and Meiklejohn are given below.

EXTRACTS FROM PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING HELD
AT CHICAGO, ILL., JAN. 20 TO 22, 1916.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE OF OFFICE
HERBERT WELCH, *President of Ohio Wesleyan University*

. . . Perhaps no company of men is on the whole so well prepared to consider this topic fairly as a company of college presidents. A body of trustees sees the social, the administrative side of it; a body of professors or even of alumni may be inclined to ignore any but the individual and theoretical aspects. But college presidents share with the trustees the sense of responsibility for the institutional life; they are not unaware of finances and constituencies and influences and impressions and historical precedents and traditions. On the other hand, they are themselves as vitally concerned as the professors in the personal applications, for their own utterances are affected by the same restrictions, if any exist. It is the president as well as the professor who has sometimes found his position untenable because of his expressed views. . . .

To discuss in detail all or any of these cases (as has recently been done in the case of Utah), in the very interesting, somewhat amusing, and sometimes irritating pamphlet of the committee of American University Professors would here be foolish and impossible. I should like to remark, however, that, after all, there has been astonishingly little interference with academic freedom either by private donors or by public officials. . . . Indeed I am inclined to think that those are right who have suggested that the evil of removing competent and fit men from academic positions has been, in the total, far less harmful in its effects on education than the retention of incompetent and unfit men. Theoretically, security of tenure of office must be sought; practically, there has in a certain class of cases been too great security; and as President Butler has pointed out, mediocrity and inefficiency are often sheltered by regard for academic rights and dignity. This fact, however, does not render less imperative a frank facing of the whole problem.

. . . This very phrase is taken from the recent report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of University Professors—a report which, even if its logic is not at every point convincing, is yet admirably balanced and indisputable, as it seems to me, in its general conclusions. Indeed I might well buttress the statements I have just been making by quoting a few sentences from that report. . . .

President Welch's paper was followed by discussion introduced by Professor U. G. Weatherly of the committee of this Association

and the discussion was then continued by President Meiklejohn of Amherst College, speaking in part as follows:

. . . With regard to the Report, presented by Professor Weatherly, I must confess a certain disappointment—that it does not go far enough, does not treat its task seriously enough. Instead of a discussion of the real issue of academic freedom, we are given a consideration of academic tenure, of the security of the professor's position. It may be answered that the Committee was directed to limit its discussions to this phase of the situation, but if so, may I register complaint as to the tactical wisdom of such a limitation. We have here a principle which is more important to us than any one of us, more important than the position of any or all professors, and for the sake of that principle I wish that the first official dealing with it by the new association might at least have had the appearance of greater disinterestedness. . . .

. . . The Report rests on the division of the activities of the college into two groups—(1) those of investigation and teaching, carried on by teachers, and (2) those of administration, which are in the hands of the trustees and president. And the question of academic freedom which the Report considers is this—Does the administration interfere with the freedom of the teachers; and if so, what can the teacher do to prevent such interference? Now I am not disputing the reality nor the importance of this question, and I should be very sorry to be interpreted as out of sympathy with the men who have formulated and are facing it. But, perhaps because of the position in which it places me as a college president, I find myself resenting the formulation if it claims to be at all fundamental in its representation of the issue. And my complaints are (1) that the formulation is relatively superficial and (2) that it ignores more significant phases of the problem which might better have been chosen as the fighting ground for the first attack. May I try to explain?

The Report presupposes the separation of teachers on the one side and president and trustees on the other, and purports to deal with the possibility that the latter should limit the freedom of the former. The supposed case is one in which the financial interests of the institution are trying to determine by limitation and perhaps by prescription what doctrines shall be taught in the institution. And to provide against this outrageous interference the Report recommends that the action of trustees and president with regard to reappointments and dismissals should be subject to some sort of check by action of members of the teaching force. But it is altogether obvious that reappointments and dismissals are not the essential features of the situation. The really important issue is that of appointments. . . .

If this Report presupposes a sinister attack by presidents and trustees upon the freedom of academic teaching, it has ignored and neglected the line along which that attack can best be made; it has concerned itself rather with

the security of the men already appointed than with the selection of new men, and the latter point is the one at which deadly work could really be done by an enemy predisposed to the doing of it. . . .

. . . It is of no use to discuss infractions of academic freedom unless we know what that freedom is, and this new association would do splendid service if it would at least make a beginning of the work of formulation at this essential point. I know from personal experience that professors object to the appointment of other men because "they do not like their points of view" and I have no doubt that presidents and trustees are influenced in the same way. Are we right or wrong in this, and if wrong, what is the extent and nature of our sin?

And in like manner, the report of the committee fails, for the present at least, to give a definition of the principle so far as it relates to the dismissal of professors. It asks that teachers be given a share in making decisions upon such cases but does not find itself able as yet to determine the grounds on which the decisions should be made. May I say frankly that I think that clearness as to principle is far more important than the proposal of modification of college organization and procedure. . . .

. . . But the essential defect of the Report seems to me to lie in the presupposition from which it starts. It separates teachers on the one hand from trustees and presidents on the other. And its question is, "How far may the first group be free from interference from the second?" But is there not also a question, a much deeper question, with regard to the freedom of the second group? Over against the question of the freedom of the teacher I should like to put that of the freedom of both groups, of the college as a whole as an institution of learning. Apparently this Report is saying, "Those who are responsible for the financial welfare of the college may, for the sake of that, attempt to interfere with the teaching; and such interference must be prevented. But what does this mean? Does it mean that the financial agents of the college are to secure support by arousing the expectation on the part of donors that certain "interests" will be served? And is it supposed further that the teachers are to see to it that such expectations are disappointed, that the promises virtually or explicitly made are not kept? I am afraid that the Report faces a rather awkward dilemma. It plans to secure academic freedom in an institution by a procedure whose fundamental presupposition is that the president and trustees are not free but are the slaves of some power which has them securely in its control. If it is the belief of the professors that the acceptance of gifts carries with it the implication that certain limitations are to be imposed upon academic freedom, then there is only one honest recommendation which they can make, viz., that such gifts be not received. The suggestion that we sell our freedom and have it too is a rather greedy one and it is inevitably at war with itself.

The point just made can be stated in another way if we note that the Report of the Committee has simply accepted a traditional and popular view

of the functions of trustees and president. It has assumed a separation in the organization of the college and has not really criticised the assumption. It is the same attitude which found expression in the sharp separation of professors and presidents when the Association was formed. But as against it, I protest that no machinery can make free an institution which is by presupposition half free and half enslaved. And further I insist that the freedom of the college as a unified whole is more important even than that of the professor, even though he be the one really important individual within the college. . . .

. . . We want more money, more buildings, more equipment, larger salaries, more students, and so long as this is true we are not in the fullest sense our own masters. For the professor who says, "But those matters are the concern of the administration; let presidents and trustees do whatever truckling may be necessary; I meanwhile will be free, secure in my opinions, my position, my salary"—for the professor who says that in word or deed I have nothing but the keenest contempt. I do not like the man who buys his dignity and purity at the cost of another's degradation. If the college is to be free, it must be free through and through, trustees, teachers, president, students alike, and so far as this is not true we can have only the semblance of freedom wherever it may appear to be. . . .

. . . I have tried in these words to express in the form of criticism my essential agreement with the Report of the Committee and with the purpose of the Association which it represents. My single complaint is that the Report does not go far enough, that it assumes as its basis a relationship within the college which is so harmful to the cause of academic freedom as to be intolerable. It may be that some such faculty "checking" of administrative action is desirable, but whether that be true or not there are more essential matters which demand our consideration. As a college president I am not content with the provision that only the other half shall be free.

CONSTITUTION OF UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Reference was made in the report of the Annual Meeting to a communication from the President of the University of Utah in regard to the new constitution of the University. The extracts reprinted below indicate its general character.

It will be noted that these new regulations are pertinent to the matters dealt with on pages 42-52 of the Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Conditions at the University of Utah, and that they supersede the provisional Plan of Administration there summarized.

The Board of Regents, acting under the laws of the State of Utah, is the governing body of the University. . . .

The Chairman of the Board of Regents shall be the Executive officer of the

Board; . . . he shall sign all contracts made and all diplomas issued . . . and he shall appoint all the committees of the Board, except the executive committee. . . .

The Secretary shall . . . be the financial accountant and the general business and purchasing agent of the University. He shall keep a complete inventory and valuation of all University property. . . . He shall keep an accurate record of all receipts and expenditures . . . and shall have general charge of all financial records, documents, contracts, books and papers of the University.

The Treasurer shall receive and hold all the funds, securities, income and revenue of the University. He shall pay out the moneys of the University on checks signed by the Chairman and the Secretary of the Board of Regents. . . .

The Board shall maintain standing committees on Executive, Finance, Faculty Relations, Buildings, Grounds, Student Activities, Student Welfare, State School of Mines, School of Engineering, School of Education, School of Arts and Sciences, School of Law, School of Medicine, Summer School, Extension Division. . . .

The actions taken by the Standing Committees, excepting the Executive Committee, shall be of effect in the management of the University, only after approval by the Board.

. . . Between meetings of the Board the Executive Committee may exercise the full power of the Board as to the ordinary business of the University.

.
The Committee on Faculty Relations shall keep informed of the views of the Faculty, and to that end shall at all times co-operate with a committee appointed by the Faculty or with the Administrative Council, to whom the Faculty shall have delegated prescribed powers and duties. The results of such deliberations shall be submitted to the Board of Regents for their action.

.
The department, office or account, shall be the primary unit of administration within the University. . . . All persons employed by the University shall be assigned to one or more of these administrative units. . . .

A school is an administrative group of departments organized for the purpose of training students for efficient service in a definite social activity. Each school may draw for service upon any department as may be needed and authorized. A department may serve several schools.

.
A professor, known as the professor in charge, appointed upon the nomination of the President, in consultation with the deans of the schools that the department serves, shall be in immediate charge of the work, rooms, equipment and supplies of the department. The professor in charge shall be responsible for the initiation and efficient execution of University policies in so far as they affect the department and for the expenditure of all funds appropriated to the department; he shall represent the department in its official business with other University authorities, with students and with the public; he shall, in consultation with the

President, nominate the persons to fill vacancies in the department; he shall make departmental reports and prepare departmental budgets; he shall supervise the work of the other members of the departmental staff, but with the provision that he must recognize their initiative. He shall not, however, undertake any work in the department entailing extra expense without the consent of the President. In the general work of the department the Professor in charge shall be responsible directly to the President, but in matters affecting the special interests of a school he shall deal with the dean or director of the school concerned.

The other members of a departmental staff are subject to the general regulations as to loyal and efficient service; they are responsible to the professor in charge for all matters pertaining to the department, though they have the privilege of appeal from the decisions of the professor in charge. . . .

§§ The dean shall be the chief executive officer of the school over which he exercises supervision; he shall preside over the meetings of the school Faculty; he shall formulate and present policies for the consideration of the school Faculty to the end that committee work may be reduced to a minimum, provided that this clause shall not be interpreted to abridge the right of any member of the school Faculty to present any matter. . . .

The President is responsible for the carrying out of such measures as the Board of Regents may enact, and all measures adopted by the faculty or councillors of the University. He is ex-officio the chairman of the University Faculty and Councils, and is the usual official medium of communication also between them and the Board of Regents and students.

With the advice of the Deans' Council, the President prepares the annual and biennial budgets for presentation to the Board of Regents. He recommends suitable persons for appointment, subject to the requirement that all appointments shall be made on the merit basis, and that nominations shall originate with a committee consisting of the head of the department and the President in case of positions on the departmental staff, and with a committee consisting of deans of the schools affected and of the President in case of nominations for head of a department. The nomination of a president shall originate with the Regents who shall call upon the Faculty to appoint a committee of three to assist the Board in its selection.

All other nominations shall originate with the President of the University in consultation with the members of the University staff directly interested.

A Vice-President may be appointed by the President from among the members of the Faculty to serve during the pleasure of the President.

The University Faculty shall determine questions of educational policy and decide upon curricula. Whenever this action involves any increase in expense, the President reports such action to the Regents with recommendations. No new line of work shall be established except by action of the Regents on recommendation of the Faculty and President.

The committee work required of the teaching staff shall be made as light as possible. Any member of the Faculty, who feels unwilling to serve upon a committee, may be excused by stating his desire to the President.

The Administrative Council includes the President, Deans and Directors of Schools and representatives of the Faculty elected by secret ballot (two more in number than the ex-officio members.) This Council shall be the direct medium of communication between the Faculty and the Regents; its purpose being to maintain a friendly understanding and to secure more completely the rights of Faculty members and Regents.

It shall have full access to the minutes of the Board of Regents, to the books of the Secretary and to any other information within the keeping of the University or any of its departments. The President shall inform the Council of proposed new appointments, removals, resignations or changes in rank of members of the teaching staff. The Council may transmit its views to the Faculty Relations Committee of the Board of Regents. Should difficulties arise between members of the Faculty or between the President and any member or members of the Faculty, or between the President and any member or members of the University staff, the matter may be referred by those concerned to the Administrative Council, in which event the Council has full right to investigate the matters in question and, if thought best, to make recommendations to the Board of Regents through the Committee on Faculty Relations. The Council may upon its own initiative consider any problem of University administration or of the relation of the Faculty members to the State, or any matter concerning the welfare of the University, and shall transmit copies of all such deliberations to the Faculty Relations Committee. The President may refer to this Council any matter upon which he feels that it would be well to have the opinion of the Council. It is also within the province of the Administrative Council to propose to the Faculty Relations Committee amendments or additions to the Regents' Regulations for the gov-

ernment of the University of Utah. This Council shall not exercise any legislative functions.

A record shall be made of all proceedings of this Council, which shall be transmitted to the members of the Faculty Relations Committee.

TENURE OF OFFICE

After three years of satisfactory service all members of the University staff are considered permanent, provided their service is still needed and continues satisfactory, and provided also that funds remain available. The appointments of all other members of the University staff shall be made or reviewed annually, except that appointments to professorships may be made for two years.

GENERAL DUTIES

Loyal and efficient service to the University, and therefore to the State and its people, together with a law-abiding and moral mode of life, shall be the tests by which the members of the University staff shall be judged. Disloyalty, inefficiency, lawlessness, immorality, or failure to abide by the regulations of the University, shall be cause for dismissal from the University.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Academic freedom in the pursuit and teaching of knowledge shall be maintained in the University of Utah.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE CASE OF PROFESSOR JOSEPH K. HART OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

On May 18, 1915, at a meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Washington, "Regent Miller moved that Dean Bolton and Professors Lull and Hart, of the Department of Education, be elected for one year from August 1, 1915, on condition that each of them file his resignation with the board to take effect not later than August 1, 1916, and that the letter of President Landes, in reference to this matter, be made a part of the minutes of this board." (From the minutes of the Regents, May 18, 1915.)

This was in effect a dismissal of the three named with a year's notice. The reasons for this action are contained in the letter of President Landes mentioned in the minutes. This letter was addressed under date of May 17, 1915, to Dean Frederick E. Bolton, Professor Herbert G. Lull and Professor Joseph K. Hart. In it, Mr. Landes says:

The time has come when official recognition must be taken of the deplorable conditions existing in the department of education. During the past three years, the personal antipathy, animosity, and distrust existing among and between you have increased steadily in intensity until now a state of bitterness exists which has destroyed the co-operation and co-ordination absolutely necessary for the successful administration of any department. . . . This condition of affairs has brought reproach to the institution and can be tolerated no longer. . . .

I am now thoroughly convinced that the general welfare of the university demands that a radical change take place in the personnel of the department of education. It is my plan, at the forthcoming annual meeting of the Board of Regents, to recommend that you three gentlemen be elected for one year only, with the understanding that you will hand your resignations to the Board of Regents not later than August 1, 1916.

With each of you, throughout your years of connection with the university, I have had very cordial and pleasant personal relations. I regard each of you as an able teacher and one capable of rendering a fine service to this institution. I need not assure you that my recommendation to the Board of Regents will be made with the profoundest regret that such a step seems necessary.

At the same meeting of the Board of Regents (May 18, 1915), Professor Hart was granted a leave of absence for one year on his

request. After receiving notice of his dismissal, he sought to forego his leave, asking to be appointed his own substitute for the year. This request was opposed by Dean Bolton and denied by President Suzzallo (who had taken office July 1, 1915). In a letter dated July 30, 1915, the latter said:

My investigations of your relations with the department of education indicate that you could not be fully co-operative under the present strained conditions. And so, for the good of the department and the university, as well as for your own best working power and usefulness, it is better not to appoint you as your own substitute, as you had requested.

Under the circumstances, you express a preference not to file the resignation conditional to your appointment for the next academic year. I think, therefore, I shall follow your preference as to a final settlement of the whole matter and let your connection with the university cease automatically July 31, 1915.

I am returning the resignation which you were kind enough to send for my use in case it seemed best to handle the matter by a method less congenial to you.

The preference of Professor Hart mentioned in this letter is expressed in a letter to President Suzzallo dated July 22, 1915, as follows: "I have no interest in resigning in order to hold this job for another year. I have every interest in being of service to the state, the university, my profession and the student body just as long as possible. I should like to remain here another year, if I can render service; if I cannot, I know that the remaining will be formal and useless."

The connection of Professor Hart with the university was accordingly severed July 31, 1915. Professor Lull remained in the university until the following spring when he was called to the State Normal School at Emporia, Kansas. Dean Bolton remained also, and was reinstated in February, 1916.

It was this reinstatement of Professor Bolton which called forth a letter (dated February 28, 1916) from Professor Hart addressed to Dean John H. Wigmore, President of the American Association of University Professors, in which he said:

I want to call to your attention the situation which exists in the University of Washington, and ask that you appoint a committee of your association to investigate the matter.

Last May, at the annual meeting of the Board of Regents, Acting-President Landes recommended that Dean F. E. Bolton, Associate Professor Lull and myself (an assistant professor) all of the department of education should be re-elected to the faculty for another

year on the condition that we should all hand in our resignations to take effect before the end of the new year for which we were being re-elected. The ostensible and avowed reason for this action was that there was a lack of co-operation in the department. The regents approved the recommendation. In addition, a leave of absence for the ensuing year (which I had asked for, previously) was granted me—which meant that I was almost immediately released from active connection with the university.

Now, it was freely charged at the time, charges appearing in several papers, and being voiced by representative men and women of the city and state, that the whole matter was a political "frame up," for the express purpose of getting rid of *me*; that there was no intention of dismissing Dean Bolton; that there were no real charges against Associate Professor Lull; but that, since I had been very active in all sorts of social and civic work, and since my name had been freely mentioned in caucus of the majority party of the legislature as one who must be got rid of, the real object of the move was to secure my dismissal, using a *departmental* difficulty to hide the *political* nature of the action, thus making it all seem like a purely *educational* affair. I have made no public statement about the matter, waiting to see what the ultimate outcome would be. That outcome has been reached this past week: *Dean Bolton has been retained in the university* as it was freely predicted he would be; Associate Professor Lull has been eliminated, not because there were any real charges against him, but (as it seems to me) in order to prove that *my* removal was not *political*.

These statements contained, in effect, charges of so serious a nature as to warrant an investigation. Accordingly, a sub-committee of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure was appointed by Chairman A. A. Young, consisting of Professor O. K. McMurray (California), W. D. Briggs (Stanford) and Harry Beal Torrey (Reed), to make an investigation into the circumstances attending Dr. Hart's retirement from the University of Washington, and report upon the case.

This committee arranged a conference with Dr. Hart and President Suzzallo (representing the University of Washington) to which both Dr. Hart and President Suzzallo were requested to invite any witnesses who might aid in determining the material facts. The conference was held July 26-28, 1916, in Seattle, the committee being represented by its chairman. The testimony of twenty-five witnesses was taken and numerous documents submitted. Many letters on various phases of the situation and interviews with several members of the faculty completed the body of evidence.

On these facts the committee has based the following conclusions:

1. That there was a serious lack of harmony within the department of education for which Professors Bolton, Lull and Hart were jointly responsible.

2. That no evidence has been presented showing that their dismissal was a result of political or other external pressure on either Board of Regents or Acting President Landes.

3. That the conditions within the department were alone adequate grounds for this action.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRY BEAL TORREY, *Chairman.*

W. D. BRIGGS.

O. K. McMURRAY.

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure has examined the report of the sub-committee on the case of Professor Joseph K. Hart. It approves the procedure followed by the sub-committee and recommends the publication of the report.

ALLYN A. YOUNG, *Chairman.*

MEMBERSHIP

The list of members published in the January BULLETIN included 1931 names. Deducting four names of deceased members and fourteen for resignations and adding ninety for elections subsequent to the annual meeting, the total membership, April 23rd, is 2003. 160 additional nominations await action in due time.

The number of institutions now represented is 100. Additions to the list since the annual meeting include Drury, Goucher and Grinnell Colleges, Kansas State Agricultural College, the State College of Washington, Rose Polytechnic Institute, George Washington and Wyoming Universities.

MEMBERS ELECTED

The following nominees whose names were published in the January or a previous BULLETIN have been elected to membership in the Association:

Byrn Mawr College
Susan M. Kingsbury

Columbia University
T. R. Powell
H. C. Sherman

Cornell University
O. M. Leland

Drury College
A. P. Hall

Goucher College
Clara L. Bacon
W. E. Kellicott

Grinnell College
C. N. Smiley

University of Illinois
F. W. Scott

State University of Iowa
H. J. Prentiss
S. B. Sloan

Johns Hopkins University
F. R. Blake
Frank Morley

Kansas State Agricultural College
A. A. Potter
Lafayette College
E. C. Bingham

University of Maine
Edith M. Patch

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

C. A. Adams
A. A. Blanchard
A. H. Gill
W. T. Hall
F. J. Moore
J. F. Norris
R. S. Williams

Miami University
C. H. Handschin
E. E. Powell

University of Michigan
C. H. Van Tyne

University of Missouri
Eva Johnston

University of Nebraska
Lawrence Fossler

College of the City of New York
Paul Klapper
F. M. Pedersen

New York University
C. L. Bristol
T. W. Edmondson

University of North Dakota

E. F. Chandler

B. J. Spence

Northwestern University

P. C. Lutkin

Arne Oldberg

Ohio State University

W. M. Barrows

W. L. Graves

H. M. Semans

R. J. Seymour

University of Pittsburgh

J. A. Koch

University of Rochester

W. J. Kirk

Rose Polytechnic Institute

F. C. Wagner

Tulane University

Pierce Butler

J. Harry Clo

N. C. Curtis

Mary L. Harkness

J. Adair Lyon

Susan D. Tew

Union College

M. C. Stewart

University of Virginia

W. A. Kepner

Thomas Fitz Hugh

W. S. Rodman

R. H. Wilson

State College of Washington

H. V. Carpenter

Bruce McCully

A. L. Melander

S. B. Nelson

George Severance

F. A. Thompson

University of Washington

W. P. Gorsuch

C. C. More

R. E. Rose

Wellesley College

Edna V. Moffett

Charlotte F. Roberts

West Virginia University

O. P. Chitwood

J. L. Sheldon

C. W. Waggoner

Whitman College

B. H. Brown

University of Wisconsin

F. L. Paxson

Yale University:

C. M. Andrews

C. M. Bakewell

R. C. Bryant

E. H. Cameron

H. H. Chapman

W. K. Shepard

CORRECTIONS

The following changes in the Secretary's official list of members are also recorded:

Amherst,
California,
Harvard,
Princeton,
Purdue,
Wisconsin,

J. A. Thompson, should be J. O. Thompson.
W. P. Taylor, resigned.
Edward Caldwell Moore, resigned.
William Gillespie, resigned.
C. H. Benjamin, resigned.
Add A. N. Winchell.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following forty-four nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions,* and will be considered by the Committee if received *before July 1*.

The Committee on Admissions* consists of J. Q. Dealey (Brown), Chairman; Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Edward Capps (Princeton), J. V. Denney (Ohio State), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

The names of nominators follow the name of each nominee in parenthesis. Nominators for whom no institution is specified are colleagues of the nominee.

William Dallam Armes (American Literature), California,
(G. R. Noyes, A. C. Lawson, C. A. Kofoid)

Fred E. Ayer (Civil Engineering), Akron,
(H. Schneider, J. T. Faig, and A. M. Wilson, Cincinnati)

Samuel G. Barton (Astronomy), Pennsylvania,
(E. S. Crawley, W. B. McDaniel, R. G. Kent)

Samuel E. Bassett (Greek), Vermont,
(R. G. Kent, J. C. Rolfe, and W. B. McDaniel, Pennsylvania)

Malvina M. Bennett (Reading and Speaking), Wellesley,
(A. J. McKeag, S. C. Hart, E. A. McC. Gamble)

Mary C. Bliss (Botany), Wellesley,
(L. E. Lockwood, K. L. Bates, E. A. McC. Gamble)

Harry C. Bradley (Drawing), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(E. B. Wilson, H. G. Pearson, H. W. Tyler)

Alice V. Brown (Art), Wellesley,
(L. E. Lockwood, M. S. Case, K. L. Bates)

Eva Chandler (Mathematics), Wellesley,
(A. J. McKeag, A. O. Norton, E. A. McC. Gamble)

Hugh A. Clarke (Music), Pennsylvania,
(E. S. Crawley, W. B. McDaniel, R. G. Kent)

John Corsa (Public Speaking), Amherst,
(J. W. Crook, R. G. Gettell, H. C. Lancaster)

William Easby, Jr. (Civil Engineering), Pennsylvania,
(J. C. Rolfe, R. G. Kent, W. B. McDaniel)

Adelbert Grant Fradenburgh (History), Adelphi,
(E. P. Tanner, W. M. Smallwood, and A. C. Flick, Syracuse)

Charles F. F. Garis (Mathematics), Union,
(E. E. Hale, S. P. Chase, Morland King)

H. W. Hayward (Mech. Engineering), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(D. C. Jackson, C. A. Adams, H. W. Tyler)

- Frank S. Hoffman (Philosophy), Union,
(E. E. Hale, S. P. Chase, Morland King)
- H. O. Hofman (Metallurgy), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(H. G. Pearson, F. S. Woods, H. W. Tyler)
- George L. Hosmer (Topog. Engin.), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(L. M. Passano, H. W. Tyler, L. J. Johnson)
- William Hovgaard (Naval Architecture), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(F. S. Woods, E. F. Langley, H. W. Tyler)
- Marian Elizabeth Hubbard (Zoölogy), Wellesley,
(M. S. Case, L. E. Lockwood, C. B. Thompson)
- Eliza H. Kendrick (Biblical History), Wellesley,
(M. S. Case, L. E. Lockwood, K. L. Bates)
- Charles E. Locke (Metallurgy), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(E. B. Wilson, H. G. Pearson, H. W. Tyler)
- Hamilton Crawford Macdougall (Music), Wellesley,
(L. E. Lockwood, M. S. Case, K. L. Bates)
- Horace Grant McKean (Public Speaking), Union,
(E. E. Hale, S. P. Chase, Morland King)
- Helen A. Merrill (Mathematics), Wellesley,
(C. B. Thompson, M. W. Calkins, A. O. Norton)
- Julia Eleanor Moody (Zoölogy), Wellesley,
(S. C. Hart, K. L. Bates, E. A. McC. Gamble)
- Robert Lee Moore (Mathematics), Pennsylvania,
(E. S. Crawley, W. B. McDaniel, R. G. Kent)
- Margaret Müller (German), Wellesley,
(C. B. Thompson, M. W. Calkins, M. S. Case)
- Cecil H. Peabody (Naval Architecture), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(F. S. Woods, E. F. Langley, H. W. Tyler)
- Arthur U. Pope (Philosophy), California,
(G. R. Noyes, C. H. Rieber, G. M. Stratton)
- Lincoln W. Riddle (Botany), Wellesley,
(L. E. Lockwood, M. W. Calkins, A. Walton)
- Benjamin H. Ripton (History), Union,
(E. E. Hale, S. P. Chase, Morland King)
- Alice Robertson (Zoölogy), Wellesley,
(A. Walton, A. O. Norton, E. A. McC. Gamble)
- William O. Sawtelle (Physics), Haverford,
(L. W. Reid, A. H. Wilson, W. W. Baker)
- Isaac J. Schwatt (Mathematics), Pennsylvania,
(E. S. Crawley, W. B. McDaniel, R. G. Kent)
- Martha Hale Shackford (Literature), Wellesley,
(S. C. Hart, K. L. Bates, E. A. McC. Gamble)
- Miles S. Sherrill (Chemistry), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(H. P. Talbot, H. G. Pearson, H. W. Tyler)
- Hervey W. Shimer (Paleontology), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(H. G. Pearson, F. S. Woods, H. W. Tyler)
- Charles P. Steinmetz (Electrophysics), Union,
(E. E. Hale, S. P. Chase, Morland King)

Roxana H. Vivian (Mathematics), Wellesley,
(A. J. McKeag, C. B. Thompson, E. A. McC. Gamble)

O. M. Washburn (Archaeology), California,
(H. C. Nutting, W. A. Merrill, L. J. Richardson)

Alpheus Grant Woodman (Chemistry), Mass. Inst. of Technology,
(H. P. Talbot, H. W. Tyler, F. S. Woods)

Charles Baker Wright (Rhetoric), Middlebury,
(K. L. Bates, S. C. Hart, and V. D. Scudder, Wellesley)

Charles Lowell Young (English Literature), Wellesley,
(L. E. Lockwood, M. W. Calkins, A. Walton)

* Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Mass. Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.